

Appl. No. 10/054,422
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1-2, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1-2. In Figure 1, previously omitted reference numeral 9 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102. Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner should telephone Mr. Peter L. Michaelson, Esq. at (732) 530-6671 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Specification amendments

Various amendments have been made to the specification to correct minor inadvertent grammatical and formal errors.

Drawings

The Applicants have discovered that reference numeral 9 has been inadvertently omitted from Figure 1. To correct this error, the Applicants have enclosed a drawing sheet for this figure showing their proposed correction in red, as well as a substitute drawing sheet that contains this correction.

The Applicants now request entry of the substitute sheet.

Status of claims

Independent claims 1, 11 and 12 have each been amended to include the limitations of prior claim 9. Claim 9 has now been canceled.

Each of dependent claims 2-8, 10 and 13 has been amended to correct minor errors.

Rejection under 35 USC § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-13 under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by the teachings in the Kracht patent (US patent 6,377,987 issued April 23, 2002 to James E. Kracht). With respect to the claims as they now stand, this rejection is respectfully traversed. To simplify the ensuing discussion, this rejection will be specifically discussed in the context of present claim 1.

Specifically, and of most pertinence, the Examiner takes the opinion that the Kracht patent discloses all the elements of claims 1 and 9, as they stood prior to this amendment. With respect to present claim 1, which is formed of the limitations of prior claims 1 and 9, the Examiner's view is incorrect.

Generally speaking, the Kracht patent addresses a technique for discovering and identifying network devices and then determining the physical topology of a network containing those devices. In particular, this patent describes the use of the Cisco Discovery Protocol (CDP) in

determining physical network topology and describes a particular technique that can be used to detect network devices which do not support CDP. Such devices are referred to as "black cloud" devices and are clearly identified as such in a resulting displayed network tree (see, e.g., Figure 8 in this patent).

The present application also generally relates to determining the topology of a network and also uses data relating to discovered devices on the network to build a network tree. Generally, when network topologies are conventionally determined, the presence of unsupported or unmanaged connecting network devices may cause some network branches to be unresolved. The present invention advantageously attempts to remedy this deficiency, thus increasing the accuracy of the resulting network map over that produced through conventional techniques. Specifically, the present invention attempts to determine the type of each discovered network device on the unresolved branch. If the type of every such device on a branch is determined to be an endstation type, then the present invention determines that an undiscovered connecting device is present on that particular branch and that device, heretofore missing, is flagged as such in the network tree.

Through the inventive technique, unresolved branches are separated into two types: (a) those in which every discovered network device on an unresolved branch is determined to be an endstation type, and (b) those in which at least one of the discovered devices on the unresolved branch is not an endstation type. Should the latter occur,

Appl. No. 10/054,422
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

the branch is left unresolved and is so indicated in the network tree.

The concept of leaving a unresolved branch as such in a network tree is simply not taught or even suggested by the teachings in the Kracht patent -- contrary to the Examiner's view.

In that regard, the Examiner points to col. 16, lines 50-57 in the Kracht patent as evidencing disclosure of this concept. However, close examination of this passage of the text reveals otherwise. This passage states as follows:

"In the link processing phase, at block 908, the process *discards any information that has been collected for incorrectly identified known devices*. For example, the process identifies those known devices that are associated with a broadcast address, associated with an address that has been assigned to the network itself, or associated with multiple IP addresses thus causing duplicate configuration information has been collected [sic] for the known device." [emphasis added]

As the Examiner can appreciate, this passage merely describes, consistent with the legend in block 908 in Figure 9, that network information for incorrectly identified devices is discarded, i.e. eliminated. This has absolutely nothing to do with leaving a branch, which has been determined to have a non-endstation type device, unresolved. As is plainly clear, nowhere in this passage is the word "branch" even mentioned or can reasonably be inferred from the text in the passage.

To further support the Applicants' view of this passage, the Applicants point to col. 9, lines 14-34 of the Kracht patent which disclose instances in which the discovery mechanism, taught in this patent, may mistakenly identify devices and thus lead to discarded network information. First, since a router may have multiple IP addresses, the mechanism may mistakenly associate two or more IP addresses, for a router, with separate known devices rather than with the single router. Second, the mechanism may mistakenly determine an initial set of IP addresses as not including all IP addresses that are actually associated with a particular network device, e.g. a router. Furthermore, the Examiner's attention is also directed to col. 11, lines 15-26 of this patent which teaches that after the discovery mechanism completes an "information-gathering" phase, it then enters a "link processing" phase during which it discards any of its previously collected network information which it determines to be incorrect or false. In that regard, col. 11, lines 18-25 expressly state:

"For example, configuration information that was collected based on a device responding to a network or broadcast address may be discarded, because these devices will have been discovered under their real IP addresses. Also, duplicate configuration information that was collected for devices having multiple IP addresses, such as routers, may be discarded as these generally will have been discovered multiple times."

Thus, in sharp distinction to the Examiner's view, the Kracht patent is totally devoid of any teachings regarding leaving, in a network topology, a network branch unresolved where that branch has a device which is not an endstation type.

Claim 1, as it now stands, contains suitable recitations directed to this distinguishing feature. Specifically, this claim states as follows, with that recitation shown in a bolded typeface:

"A method for determining the topology of a network when a network tree, built from data relating to discovered devices of the network, includes one or more unresolved branches, the method comprising:

for each unresolved branch of the network tree, attempting to determine the type of each of the discovered network devices on the branch[, and];

if the type of each discovered network device on the branch is determined to be an endstation type, inferring that an undiscovered connecting device is present on the branch; and

if the type of at least one discovered network device on the branch is not an endstation type, leaving the topology of the branch unresolved." [emphasis added]

Hence, the Applicants submit that inasmuch as this claim is not identically disclosed by the teachings in the Kracht patent, this claim is not anticipated by those teachings. Accordingly, this claim is patentable under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(e).

Similar distinguishing recitations appear in each of the Applicants' other independent claims, namely claims 11 and 12. Consequently, the Applicants submit that each of these claims is also not anticipated by and thus patentable over the teachings in the Kracht patent.

Each of dependent claims 2-8, 10 and 13 recites further distinguishing features of the present invention and depends, either directly or indirectly, from either independent claims 1 or 12. Accordingly, each of these

Appl. No. 10/054,422
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

dependent claims is not anticipated by the teachings of the Kracht patent for the exact same reasons set forth above. Hence, these claims are also patentable under the provisions of 35 USC § 102(e).


Conclusion

Thus, the Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, is anticipated under the provisions of 35 USC § 102.

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

June 8, 2005


Peter L. Michaelson, Attorney
Reg. No. 30,090
Customer No. 007265
(732) 530-6671

MICHAELSON & ASSOCIATES
Counselors at Law
Parkway 109 Office Center
328 Newman Springs Road
P.O. Box 8489
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701

Appl. No. 10/054,422
Amdt. dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **June 9, 2005** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Signature

30,090

Reg. No.

1/3




Fig. 1




Fig. 2